

**REMARKS**

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 2, 2007.

Claims 1-7 are pending. Claim 1 is independent.

Claims 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite because "no means of measuring [the 'longest time'] is available."

Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand how to determine the various lifetimes of different pixels by, for example, referring to documentation or test results regarding the different pixel types. One of ordinary skill in the art, as informed by the present application, could then determine "the subset among the plurality of subsets which provides the desired colour with the longest life time of the sub-pixels," as recited by claim 7.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is not indefinite, and applicants request withdrawal of the rejection to that claim under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,570,584 (Cok).

Claim 1 is not anticipated by Cok at least because claim 1 recites:

each full-colour pixel (RGBX) comprising four sub-pixels, a red (R), a green (G), a blue (B) and a fourth sub-pixel (X), characterised in that the fourth sub-pixel (X) emits light of a fourth non-white colour with an efficiency higher than the efficiency of each of the R (red), G (green), and B (blue) sub-pixel.

(emphasis added).

By way of the invention of claim 1, the fourth sub-pixel emits light with a higher efficiency than the efficiency of each of red, green and blue sub-pixels.

On the other hand, Cok merely describes that "sub-pixels generally vary in their efficiency" and that "the addition of an extra element ... may increase the brightness, and/or lifetime efficiency of the display." (Cok at column 3, lines 50-53).

Cok does not teach "the fourth sub-pixel (X) emits light of a fourth non-white colour with an efficiency higher than the efficiency of each of the R (red), G (green), and B (blue) sub-pixel," as is recited by claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Cok, and applicants request withdrawal of the rejection to that claim.

Claims 2-7 ultimately depend from claim 1 and are therefore not taught by Cok for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-7 are in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) to those claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the currently-pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Im  
Registration No. 50,418

Date: 2 August 2007

/ James Dobrow /  
By: James Dobrow  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,666

Mail all correspondence to:

Paul Im, Registration No. 50,418  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9627  
Fax: (914) 332-0615